	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MISSOURI	FILED
		SEP - 6 2013
EX RELATIONE (C-i-b. El-Ali),		U. S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MO ST. LOUIS
Petitioner / Propria Po	ersona Sui Juris.	
	)	
	) Case No	
v.	)	
	)	
	) Div No	
	)	
CITY OF ST. LOUIS		
OFFICER R. BROWN	I (DSN-3996)	
OFFICER RANDY L	. HAYS (DSN-1250) Assignment # 308-Group 721	
SERGEANT UNNAM	ED WHITE FEMALE OFFICER (DSN- unknown at	t this time)
Defendants.		

# **CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHT(S) COMPLAINT**

I, EX RELATIONE (**C-i-b. El-Ali**) hereby declare the following is true and correct. Reference: Citation Number #(13-031703)

The Petitioner / Propria Persona Sui Juris, submit the following complaint / affidavit in support of his forthcoming action(s) against the Defendants for the redress the deprivation of rights secured by the Constitution and Common law.

The Petitioner / Propria Persona Sui Juris EX RELATIONE (C-i-b. El-Ali), documents for the record that S.T.L City police falsified the police report in violation of the Petitoners' rights under the Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and any other law the court(s) deems proper.

The Petitioner / Propria Persona Sui Juris EX RELATIONE (C-i-b. El-Ali) was stopped and detained because his private sovereign vehicle had mechanical issues.

I, the Petitioner, (C-i-b. El-Ali), state and Publish for the Record: My 'Declaration of Status': Aboriginal / Indigenous Natural Person; Freehold by Birthright, Inheritance and Primogeniture; Affirming my Substantive Rights to Travel upon the public Roadways and Highways, in harmony with the Highest and most supreme Law of the Land.

I Am 'In Propria Persona' (Not Pro Se); and not 'Cognate' to any 'Nom de Guerre' or any other such like fiction entity; created by the hands of others by way of Misrecital or 'Artificial Legal Construct'; nor a 'Man-of-Straw'; as written, typed, photocopied, or scribed in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS). I am a Natural Dweller and Natural Citizen in, of, and on the Lands of my Forefathers - Northwest Amexem / Northwest Africa / North America / The North Gate.

#### References:

Declaration Of The Rights Of The Child – International Law - 1959: Principle 3: "The child shall be entitled from his birth to a name and a nationality".

Universal Declaration Of Human Rights Of 1948 – General Assembly: International Law: Article 15:

- (1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.
- (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

The Rights of Indigenous People E/Cn. 4/Sub. 2/1994/2/Add. 1 (1994). Part 1, Article 5,

Every Indigenous Individual Has The Right To A Nationality.

Treaty of Peace and Friendship Between Morocco and The United States: 1787 / 1836

Treaty of Marrakech – Supreme Law of the Land

United States Executive Order 13107: "The Implementation of Human Rights Treaties"

### Jurisdiction:

Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution

Clause 2: This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby; any Thing in the Constitution or the Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

COMES NOW the Alleged Accused, and Petitioner, (C-i-b. El-Ali),, In Propria Persona; a 'Natural Person' and NOT a 14th Amendment Corporate Person nor a 'Nom de Guerre' construct, whose Substantive Rights have been violated and abridged; standing squarely "In Propria Persona, Sui Juris" and upon my Birthright Nobility, being 'In Full Life', duly Affirmed under allegiance to my Moorish American Nation; Organic 'Right Law' Republican Form of Government, North America; and under Affirmation and Oath to the Five Principles of Light – being, Love, Truth, Peace, Freedom and Justice, (Isonomi); and being "Part and Parcel" of this organic said Government; do squarely Affirm and Attest to the Truth. I am appearing 'Specially' and not 'Generally'. To demand for this Court to have the following Alleged Tickets / Suits / Summon(s) / Citation(s) / (misrepresented) Bill(s) of Exchange: Numbered, Ticket number(s) Here, and the unlawful and 'colorable' proceedings, unlawful warrants, etc., related to it / them, declared as Vacated; as Void; and as lawless Tickets / Suits / Summons / Citations / (misrepresented) Bill(s) of Exchange, For the Court's lack of 'Subject Matter Jurisdiction'; the lack of 'Personam Jurisdiction'; the lack of 'Due Process'; the lack of an 'Injured Party' (Corpus Delicti); and that the State does not, nor does any of its subordinate corporate Entities or Agent(s), have any lawful right or lawful authority, to transfer or convert the exercising of a 'Right' into a 'Crime'; nor does the State possess such authority; nor does any of its franchised corporate Entities, Agent(s), or Officers possess, the lawful right, or authority, to punish, to incriminate, or to charge anyone with a 'Crime', absent of a 'True Bill' and 'Indictment' by a Grand Jury; or to injure, or to intimidate, or to threaten any Natural Person / People or Citizen(s) for enjoying or exercising any 'Substantive Right' (or any other secured 'Right') exercised by them, and secured for the people by the Established Law of the Land.

Reserving all Rights secured for the Natural Person / People and Citizen(s), under the Supreme Law of the Land; and Reserving all other Natural Rights, Divine Rights, Substantive Rights, Liberties, Privileges and Immunities, Reserved for the People and Citizens; secured under the Authority of the Constitution for The United States Republic of North America; and by International Law; to which the Judges of every State; the Officers of this Court; all State Agents / Agencies; all other Contractors, Officers and / or Representatives of, or for, New Jersey State Republic; or the Officers or Agent(s) of the foreign State of New Jersey Corporate Entity, are Bound to uphold, to support, and to respect, by Law and by Oath, the Supreme Law. It is further stated, for the record, that the State's hired Officers, Employees, Agent(s) and Entities (being the same, in partnership) are Bound, to support and to uphold

the Constitution for The Unites States Republic; and that the unlawful theft (under a color-of-law) of my personal Liberties, Rights, Immunities, Person, or Property; being Held, Abridged, or Arrested by any Official, Person(s) or Agent(s) contracted by the Officers of Court name here, Incorporated, or by its Employees, for monetary ransom, or legal extortion by virtue of (voided Due Process action(s); or for any other extorting or 'colorable' purposes, is a violation of the Substantive Rights of myself; a crime against the sacred Trust of the Natural People; a violation of 'Fiduciary Duty'; An 'Abandonment of Office'; a 'Perjury of Oath'; and repugnant to the Constitution. These conspired acts of collusion and practices of abusing authority are by 'Colore Officii'.

Ticket(s) / Suit(s) / Summons / Citation(s), etc., are all 'Bills of Exchange'. Anyone who is served with these 'implied in law' – contract - Instruments, should be made cognizant of having the 'right' to be served the 'Original' copy of the said Instrument; and their right to sign the Original Instrument, and pay it on the spot. And if the Police Officer(s) or Agent(s) denies the recipient the capacity to do so, then the Ticket(s) / Citation(s) / Bill(s) of Exchange are voided, as the process is unlawful in its nature in the first instance. The Natural Person(s) being (effectively) imposed with these Instruments are systematically denied the ability to receive the 'Original' copy of these Instrument(s) / Bill(s) of Exchange / Presentment(s), and thus the 'proper service' principle of due process is 'Colored'. The recipient is, thus, disabled to 'return' the Original Instrument(s) / Presentment(s) / Bill(s) of Exchange to the issuing 'Drawer', appearing to 'not' have been willing to accept the Original, and thus 'Honor' the 'Bill(s) at the instance of the issuance of it / them. This contrived violation of 'Due Process' of Law ultimately manifests (in Court) with an Administrative / Ministerial Court 'decision' or 'conviction' made or levied against the unsuspecting, so-called, 'Violator'. This act is a supreme violation against Article III of the Constitution, and is void of law - essentially a nullity.

It is reasonable for any Natural Person(s) or Citizen(s) to assume that the Municipal Court would recognize such 'Improper Service' as being void of law; and that such an improper service, as prescribed and defined under 'The Bills of Exchange Act', constitutes 'Misrepresentation' and 'Negative Misprision'.

In order for a 'Bill of Exchange' or 'Presentment' (which Ticket(s) / Citation(s) / or Summons all constitute) to have and possess lawful validity, the Drawer has to have, and has to possess, the authority and knowledge to create it. Police Officers, establishing for themselves, the position of Drawer(s); and any other person(s) or Agent(s) who issue such quasi – judicial instruments, are aware of the facts of law, concerning these Instruments' and their violation – of – due process nature. Policemen and other Municipal Agents (Drawer(s) have been, and are, continually violating the Natural People and Citizens. They create the conditions that (falsely) establish that the Natural Person(s) and Citizens, to whom the Drawer / Policemen or Agent(s) issue such Ticket(s) / Suit(s) / Summon(s) / Citation(s) / (misrepresented) Bill(s) of Exchange, go into 'Dishonor' and are, thus, convicted in Court by Default and Dishonor, by way of the 'misrepresented' process. This causes the recipient(s) of such Instruments to appear (under threat, duress, and coercion) before the non-Article III Municipal Court(s), as a 'Drawee' in 'Dishonor'.

The Court Officers are well aware of this 'constructed' faulty process; and are aware that the recipient of such Bill(s) of Exchange - Instruments should be given the 'Original' copy of the Ticket(s) / Suit(s) / Summons / Citation(s) Bill(s) of Exchange; in order that the unsuspecting recipient may have the opportunity to Return, or satisfy or Honor the 'payment' Demand of pre-prescribed and adjudged payment to the Drawer / Policeman / Prosecuting Witness/ Accuser, being the creator of, and issuer of, that Bill(s) of Exchange Instrument. Policeman or other Agent(s) who issues such Instruments; and address them to others, are, by legal definition, the 'Drawer'.

The possession of weapons by anti-constitution Officials, Policemen and other corporate Agent(s); and their practiced enforcement of a Color-of-Law; and the applying of, and the using of, contemptuous methods and the issuing of misrepresented Instruments, to subvert Due Process; and their practiced abrogation of, and their suppression of, 'The Bill of Rights'; and their addressing of other violations made by, or initiated by, the State, or by its franchised Officers, Agent(s) or Agencies, have been, and are used and initiated to rob, to threaten, to intimidate, or to injure the Natural People and Citizens. All of these acts are violations of Established Law. The Supreme Court of these United States, under the command of its 'Republican Form of Government', as Established under the Constitution for the United States, has ruled that such actions, laws and ordinances, on the part of the State, it Officers, and its Agents, are a 'Color-of-Law' and are unconstitutional. These collective 'Colore Officii' acts and laws, initiated under a 'Color-of-Authority' are in violation of Title 18, Chapter 13, Sections 241 and 242 of The United States Codes of Law; and are also in violation of Title 42 of the Codes of Law for The United States of America.

- 1. The Petitioner / EX RELATIONE (**C-i-b. El-Ali**) is a Sovereign-Nationalist and resident of the United States of America.
- 2. The Petitioner asserts that for the record that he became an Adult Sovereign-Nationalist in 1994 (at the age of 17) when his father a free Moor and Sovereign-Nationalist proclaimed his own LEGAL NOTICE NAME DECLARATION, CORRECTION PROCLAMATION AND PUBLICATION AND JUDICIAL NOTICE AND PROCLAMATION.
- 3. The Petitioner asserts that once his father (A Free Moor) established his Nationality his children are allowed the same.

### **PARTIES**

- 4. The Petitioner asserts that the Defendant, the **CITY OF ST. LOUIS**, is a created and existing political division in the State of Missouri.
- 5. Defendant, Police OFFICER R. BROWN (DSN-3996) is and was at all times relevant hereto a police officer of the city St. Louis Police Department, having his principal business address at Clark Ave. STL,MO 63101, and acted under the color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of the state of Missouri. Police OFFICER R. BROWN (DSN-3996) is being sued in his official and individual capacity.
- 6. Defendant, Police OFFICER RANDY L. HAYS (DSN-1250) is and was at all times relevant hereto a police officer of the city St. Louis Police Department, having his principal business address at Clark Ave. STL,MO 63101, and acted under the color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of the state of Missouri. Police OFFICER RANDY L. HAYS (DSN-1250) is being sued in his official and individual capacity.
- 7. Defendant, Police SERGENT UNNAMED WHITE FEMALE OFFICER (DSN-) is and was at all times relevant hereto a police officer of the city St. Louis Police Department, having his principal business address at Clark Ave. STL,MO 63101, and acted under the color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of the state of Missouri. Police SERGENT UNNAMED WHITE FEMALE OFFICER (DSN-) is being sued in his official and individual capacity.

# **ALLEGATIONS OF FACTS**

- 8. On June 29, 2013 the Petitioner (C-i-b. El-Ali) had mechanical issues with his private sovereign vehicle and therefore pulled over to the curb of Bishop L. Scott Ave at approximately 4:00 pm.
- 9. The Petitioner asserts that he pulled to the curb before the Defendant Police OFFICER(s) pulled behind him and turned on their emergency police car lights.
- 10. The Petitioner asserts that he was initially stopped for and charged with IMPEDING THE FLOW OF TRAFFIC, even while he was pulled to the side of the curb.
- 11. The Petitioner asserts that was no signs of No Park at Bishop L. Scott @ Cottage.
- 12. The Petitioner asserts that the STL-City Police truck video monitor will verify the before mention.
- 13. The Petitioner asserts that there was no probable cause for these above mentioned police officers to stop him (or) search his Vehicle Identification Number [VIN].

- 14. The Petitioner asserts that The U.S. Constitution prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures and requires any warrant to be judicially sanctioned and supported by probable cause.
- 15. The Petitioner asserts that thereafter the (2) two S.T.L city police officers (Hay DSN-1250 and DSN- R. Brown 3996) parked approximately 5 –to- 8 feet behind my private sovereign vehicle with their emergency lights on.
- 16. The Petitioner asserts that he then pulled his sovereign vehicle to the right on cottage.
- 17. The Petitioner asserts that S.T.L city police officer(s) Hay DSN-1250 and DSN- R. Brown 3996 followed and placed their emergency lights on.
- 18. The Petitioner asserts that he placed his private sovereign vehicle in park and remained unmoved until the Defendants approached his person.
- 19. The Petitioner asserts that Defendants S.T.L city police officer(s) Hay DSN-1250 and R. Brown 3996 then walked up to my private sovereign vehicle.
- 20. The Petitioner asserts that he asked the Defendants what was the emergency.
- 21. The Petitioner asserts that Defendants S.T.L city police officer(s) Hay DSN-1250 and DSN- R. Brown 3996 asked was he having problems with his vehicle.
- 22. The Petitioner asserts that stated yes, but he told the Defendants S.T.L city police officer(s) Hay DSN-1250 and DSN- R. Brown 3996 that it was not an emergency.
- 23. The Petitioner asserts that he asked the officers how many Sovereign-Nationalists, with private vehicle tags had they detained because of vehicle mechanical issues?
- 24. The Petitioner asserts that he asked the officers what was the probable cause to detain and question him?
- 25. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant Hay DSN-1250 asked the Petitioner / Private Sovereign Nationalist for his driver's license.
- 26. The Petitioner asserts that he respectfully stated to the Defendant S.T.L city police officer Hay DSN-1250 that he was not a driver, but a travel.

- 27. The Petitioner asserts that there is no question that a "Bench Summons", a detention, an arrest, a ticket or citation, issued by a Police Officer or by others for parking or traveling with no driver's license, a foreign driver's license, no current registration, or no mandatory insurance, etc., which carries a fine or jail time, is a penalty or sanction; and is indeed "converting a right into a crime", thus, violating substantive rights. It is reasonable to assume that the Court's judicial decisions are straight and to the Point, and that there is no lawful method for government to put restrictions or limitations on Rights belonging to the people. The right to own and to possess Private Property and Personality, and to be secure in those rights, is preserved and secured for the people and the citizens, by the Constitution. Government does not give rights, for it has no rights to give or to sell, nor to license. Government is put in place to protect and to secure the preexisting, Inalienable Rights of the People and the citizens.
- 28. The Petitioner asserts that The Right of a citizen to Travel upon the public highways and to transport one's property thereon, either by carriage or automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city may prohibit or permit at will but a common right which he / she has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. **Thompson v. Smith 154SE 579.**
- 29. The Petitioner asserts that "No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it." **Murdock v. Penn., 319 US 105.**
- 30. The Petitioner asserts that "If the state converts a liberty into a privilege, the citizen can engage in the right with impunity." **Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 373 US 262.**
- 31. The Petitioner asserts that "Traffic infractions are not a crime." People v. Battle, 50 Cal. App. 3,step 1, 123 Cal.Rptr. 636,639.
- 32. The Petitioner asserts that "Speeding, driving without a license, wrong plates or no plates, no registration, no tags, etc., have been held to be "non-arrestable offenses" (Cal V. Farley, 98 Cal. Rep. 89, 20 CA 3d 1032.
- 33. The Petitioner asserts that The Right to Travel; The Right to Mode of Conveyance; The Right to Locomotion are all absolute rights, and the police cannot make void the exercise of Rights. State v. Armstead, 60 s. 778, 779, and 781.

- 34. The Petitioner asserts that Traveling in an automobile on the public roads was not a threat to the public safety or health and constituted no hazard to the public, and such a traveler owed nothing more than "due care" (as regards to tort for negligence) to the public and the owner owed no other duty to the public (eg. State), he / she and his / her auto, having equal rights to and on the roadways / highways as horses and wagons, etc.; this same right is still substantive rule, in that speeding, running stop signs, traveling without license plates, or registration are not threats to the public safety, and thus, are not arrest-able offenses. Christy v. Elliot, 216 I 131, 74 HE 1035, LRA NS 1905 1910: California v. Farley 98 CED Rpt. 89, 20 CA 3d 1032 (1971).
- 35. The Petitioner asserts that for a crime to exist, there must be an injured party (Corpus Delicti) There can be no sanction or penalty imposed on one because of this Constitutional right.

  Sherer v. Cullen 481 F. 945.
- 36. The Petitioner asserts that when a citizen is attempting to enforce the Constitution, as herein shown, he is doing so "not for himself alone but also [for others] as a 'private attorney general' vindicating a policy that [the Constitution writers] considered of the highest priority." Newman v Piggie Park Enterprises, 390 US 400; 88 S Ct 964, 966; 19 L Ed 2d 1263, 1265 (1969); Oatis v Crown Zellerbach Corp, 398 F2d 496, 499 (CA 5, 1968); and Jenkins v United Gas Corp, 400 F2d 28, 33 n 10 (CA 5, 1968).
- 37. The Petitioner asserts that he respectfully stated to the Defendant S.T.L city police officer Hay DSN-1250 that to have a state driver's license is to deal in commerce.
- 38. The Petitioner asserts that he respectfully stated to the Defendant S.T.L city police officer Hay DSN-1250 that he couldn't have driver's license because he was a Private Sovereign Nationalist.
- 39. The Petitioner asserts that he told the officer(s) that he was traveling and dealing in Private Moorish Governmental Affairs.
- 40. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant Hay asked the Private Sovereign National what was his slave name.
- 41. The Petitioner asserts that he respectfully stated to the Defendant Hays that the slave name was not his holy name and he therefore cannot acknowledge it.
- 42. The Petitioner asserts that Defendants S.T.L city police officer Hay DSN-1250 walked back to his police-car.

- 43. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant R. Brown stood at the private sovereign vehicle gauging the Petitioner very strange (reckless eye balling).
- 44. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant Hay returned to back to steering wheel side of the Private Sovereign vehicle and asked the Petitioner again what his slave name was.
- 45. The Petitioner asserts that he (again) respectfully stated to the Defendant officer Hays that the slave name was not his holy name (Nationalist Name) and he therefore cannot acknowledge it.
- 46. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant Hay asked the Petitioner do you have identification.
- 47. The Petitioner asserts to the officers that he was waiting on his Travel and Nationalist card to be mailed to him.
- 48. The Petitioner asserted to the officer(s) that he did have his travel papers (LEGAL NOTICE NAME DECLARATION, CORRECTION PROCLAMATION AND PUBLICATION AND JUDICIAL NOTICE AND PROCLAMATION) and thereafter handed these travel papers to Defendant S.T.L city police officer Hay DSN-1250.
- 49. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant S.T.L city police officer Hay DSN-1250 never returned his travel papers, and therefore (stole) his travel papers (unreasonable searches and seizures).
- 50. The Petitioner asserts that he respectfully stated to the Defendant Hays that, "Kolender v. Lawson (461 U.S. 352 1983) in which the United States Supreme Court ruled that a police officer could not arrest a citizen (National) merely for refusing to present identification."
- 51. The Petitioner asserted to the officers that he did not understand what his threat to public safety was to even justify the officers to even look at him, because he was pulled to the curb of Bishop L. Scott Ave, with National Private Sovereign Vehicle Tags.
- 52. The Petitioner asserted to the officers that the United Nations have ruled that all Indigenous people in the world have a right to their nationality.
- 53. The Petitioner asserted to the defendant city officers that they were violating international law.
- 54. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant S.T.L city police officer Hay DSN-1250 stated, "So what sue me."
- 55. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant S.T.L city police officers officer Randy L. Hays (dsn-1250) assignment # 308-group 721 and Sergeant unnamed white female officer (dsn-unknown at this time) illegally stole his Moorish American Sovereign-National vehicle tags.

- 56. The Petitioner asserts that Defendant S.T.L city police officer R. Brown 3996 asked the Petitioner how long was he Sovereign-National?
- 57. The Petitioner asserts that he was born a Moorish American (Sovereign-National).
- 58. The Petitioner asserts that once he was inside the Police Station Defendant S.T.L city police officer R. Brown 3996 began to search him, thereafter defendant officer Brown place his entire hands inside the petitioner's underwear and stated I'm about to grab a hand full of balls and ass.
- 59. Petitioner incurred reasonable attorney and legal fees of \$3000.00 in connection with illegal arrest.
- 60. By reason of conduct the defendant(s) are apart of this complaint.
- 61. The conduct of defendants deprived Petitioner of the following rights, privileges and immunities secured to him by the Constitution of the United States:
- (a). The right of Petitioner to have Freedom of Speech and petitioning the government for redress of a grievances under the First Amendments to the Constitution of the United States (Amendment. I, of the U.S. Constitution).
- (b). The right of Petitioner to be secure in his person and effects against unreasonable search and seizure under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States (Amendment. IV and XIV of the U.S. Constitution).
- (c). The right of Petitioner not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and the right to the equal protection of the laws, secured by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States (Amendments. V and XIV, of the U.S. Constitution).
- (d). The right of Petitioner to not be inflicted with Nor cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States (Amendment. VIII of the U.S. Constitution).
  - 62. The act of defendants, were performed knowingly, intentionally and maliciously, by reason of which Petitioner is entitled to an award of punitive and actual damages of Three Million Dollars.

- 63. The personal injuries against the Petitioner's emotional make-up and creative losses of which Petitioner's complains were the direct and proximate result of said negligence.
- 64. The St. Louis Police Department, St. Louis Department of Public Safety and all other Defendants are liable for the actions and conduct of above mention.

WHEREFORE, the Petitioner claims:

- 1. Monetary damages of not less than Three Million Dollars;
- 2. Actual and Punitive damages;
- 3. Legal fees and cost provided by 42 U.S.C \* 1988;
- 4. Prejudgment interest;
- 5. Such other relief in law or equity as the court deem appropriately

BY: Cib. EL-ALI

JURY DEMAND

The Petitioner, Cib. EL-ALI hereby demands a jury trial on all Counts of this Complaint

C-i-b. El-Ali

Signature Cib, El- Ui

Petitioner / Propria Persona Sui Juris

1025 Sa-ta Luis STL, Mo 67138 214) 749-3200